

REMARKS

I. Explanation of amendments.

In this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 20-25 are amended, claims 11-15 and 26-31 are cancelled, and claims 32-47 are added. The specification is amended to correct a typographical error where, in a single instance, Y_3 is designated Y_1 . As Y_1 and Y_2 refer to bicyclic and tricyclic systems, respectively, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the proviso " Y_1 cannot be an optionally substituted phenyl" must refer to Y_3 which may be defined as a phenyl or heteroaromatic ring. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 20-25 as amended and new claims 32-47 find support throughout the application and are intended solely to correct this typographical error or improve the style with which the invention is claimed in accordance with the Examiners suggestions. Applicant hereby states that the amendments and new claims do not represent new matter. The Applicants do not intend by these or any other amendments to abandon the subject matter of any claim as originally presented, and reserve the right to pursue such subject matter in other applications, such as continuing applications and divisional applications.

II. The Patent Office's allegation that the information disclosure statement failed to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98, and MPEP 609 should be withdrawn.

Enclosed are new copies of the 94 references filed in the Information Disclosure Statement which were received by the Patent Office but not properly forwarded to the Examiner.

III. The Patent Office's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

At pages 3-4 of the Office action, the Patent Office rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 20-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, alleging that these claims were indefinite. Claim 1 has been amended to recite a claim in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Claims 2, 4, and 20-25 have been amended to recite proper Markush claim language in

accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Claim 6 was rejected for reciting "5 R1 groups". R1 is defined in lines 21-25 of claim 6 and per our discussion this term appears to be definite. Applicants submit that the claims are imbued with clarity and the rejection and in light of the above comments, request that the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance all pending claims in the application are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks.

An early allowance of all claims on the merits is respectfully requested. Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application toward allowance, the examiner is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Respectfully Submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN
6300 Sears Tower
233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6402
(312) 474-6300

By:


Mark H. Hopkins, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,775

March 31, 2003